

making amendments, applicant may rely on the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed (MPEP § 608.04).

Applicant amends the specification to repeat existing disclosure for improved readability and consistency throughout the specification. More specifically, aspects relating to the preferred embodiment that were originally recited in the *Detailed Description* are now additionally discussed in the *Summary* or repeated in the early paragraphs of the *Detailed Description*. The amended disclosure recited above on pages 4, 5 and 8 find support in the original application on page 11, lines 28-32, page 12, lines 1-19, page 16, lines 20-29, and Figure 5. The additional disclosure is repetitive of the original text contained therein. Also, a rewording of a passage where the same meaning remains intact is permissible (MPEP 2163.07 citing *In re Anderson*, 176 U.S.P.Q. 331 (CCPA 1973)).

The Amendment to the specification on page 7 corrects an obvious error. The sentence starting on page 7, line 28 originally stated a functional insert and a functional core, however the previous sentence refers to a surrounding body and a functional insert. The amended disclosure makes the sentence consistent with the entire specification.

Amendments to the specification on page 10 corrects obvious spelling errors in the word "molybdenum" and amendments on pages 12 and 19 corrects the obvious omission of the degree symbol in temperature. Also, on page 12, the measurement of CTE in "ppm/°C" is now followed by the additional disclosure "where the CTE is measured at ambient temperature" to reinforce the conditions of measurement of CTE by those skilled in the art. The mere inclusion of art-recognized definitions known at the time of an application is not considered new matter (MPEP § 2163.07).

Applicant submits amended Claims 1, 13, 15-31, and 33-38. Applicant also submits new Claims 39-41. All claims find support in the original disclosure.

Amended Claims 1, 15 and 16 find support in the original specification on page 3, line 34-35, page 11, lines 28-32, on page 12, lines 1-19, and in Figure 5.

Amended Claim 18 finds support in the original specification at page 3, line 3 and page 9, lines 6-9.

Claims 6 and 7 are amended to include combinations of metals in the functional insert and surrounding body as originally disclosed on page 7, lines 28-35 and on page 8, lines 1-11.

Claims 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 were amended to correct errors in dependency.

Amended Claim 31 was amended to correct an error in antecedent basis.

Finally, new Claims 39, 40 and 41 find support on page 11, lines 28-32, page 12, lines 1-19, page 16, lines 20-29 and Figure 5.

Applicant thanks Examiner for examination of this Amendment preliminary to review.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 3, 1999

by: Eileen T. Mathews  
Eileen T. Mathews, Reg. No. 41,973  
CALFEE, HALTER & GRISWOLD LLP  
800 Superior Avenue, Suite 1400  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 622-8661

Attorney for Applicant